R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 130 EA 000 211

KENOSHA, WISCONSIN, WHEN COMMUNICATION BETWEEN A FISCALLY DEPENDENT SCHOOL BOARD AND COMMUNITY BREAKS DOWN. REPORT OF AN INVESTIGATION.

By- BARR, W. MONTFORT AND OTHERS
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSN., WASHINGTON, D.C.
WISCONSIN EDUCATION ASSN., MADISON

PUB DATE OCT 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.72 43F.

DESCRIPTORS- *BOARDS OF EDUCATION, *CITY GOVERNMENT, *COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS, SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, FINANCIAL POLICY, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL DISTRICT SPENDING, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, SCHOOL SUPPORT, FISCAL CAPACITY, KENOSHA, MADISON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A SCHOOL BUDGET CONTROVERSY IN KENOSHA, WISCONSIN, STIMULATED AN NEA-WEA SPECIAL COMMITTEE STUDY OF THE CONTROVERSY, THE COMMUNITY, THE CITY GOVERNMENT, AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM. SCHOOL FINANCES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE CITY COUNCIL WERE CHRONOLOGICALLY TRACED. COMMUNICATION BREAKDOWN BETWEEN THE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE CITY COUNCIL WAS PERCEIVED TO BE THE MAJOR CAUSE OF THE CONTROVERSY. THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE, CENTERING UPON THIS PROBLEM, RECOMMENDED THAT (1) DESTRUCTIVE CRITICISM BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY AGENCIES MUST CEASE, (2) THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION, WITH ITS MORE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, MUST ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR DETERMINING FUNDS NEEDED TO SUPPORT A QUALITY EDUCATION PROGRAM, (3) AN IN-DEPTH STUDY OF DISTRICT NEEDS AND RESOURCES SHOULD BE MADE BY SPECIALISTS, (4) AN ORGANIZED SYSTEM OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED, (5) WRITTEN POLICIES OF THE BOARD AND THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION SHOULD BE REEXAMINED AND SHOULD CLEARLY DELINEATE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE VARIOUS AGENCIES, (6) A COMMITTEE OF CITIZENS AND OFFICIALS SHOULD EXAMINE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION, AND (7) EACH GROUP MUST FULFILL ITS RESPONSIBILITIES AND WORK TO FOSTER GOOD INTERACTION WITH OTHER GROUPS. THE COMMITTEE CONCLUDED THAT KENOSHA CHILDREN WERE RECEIVING ABOVE-AVERAGE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES. (HM)

★ REPORT OF AN INVESTIGATION ★

ED011130

Kenosha, Wisconsin

WHEN COMMUNICATION BETWEEN A FISCALLY DEPENDENT SCHOOL BOARD AND COMMUNITY BREAKS DOWN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
of the
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES
and the
WISCONSIN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

OCTOBER 1966

EA 000 211

The National Education Association, with its affiliated organizations, represents more than one million American teachers and, therefore, is in a position to speak for the teaching profession of the United States.

In 1941 the National Education Association organized the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education to help develop understanding of the important relationship between a better education for all our people and the maintenance of our American democracy and way of life and to bring to the teaching profession greater strength and unity in working for increased democracy in and through education. In 1961 the Representative Assembly merged the Commission with the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom to form the National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities. The functions of this Commission are—

1. To defend members of the teaching profession, schools, and the cause of education against unjust attacks; to investigate controversies involving teachers and schools justly, fearlessly, and in the public interest.

2. To encourage the development and use of personnel policies that attract and hold competent professional personnel and prevent unnecessary difficulties.

3. To aid in improvement and extension of state tenure legislation.

4. To promote the civil and human rights of members of the teaching profession and foster conditions of academic freedom under which teachers may safely teach the truth without fear or favor.

5. To gather information about the various individuals and groups who criticize or oppose education and make résumés of their activities.

6. To investigate cases of alleged unethical conduct by members of the teaching profession when requested to do so by the Committee on Professional Ethics.

7. To investigate charges and report to the NEA Executive Committee the name of any member who violates the requirements of Article I of the NEA Bylaws.

8. To issue reports and engage in such other activities as are appropriate to the development of better understanding by the profession and the public of the areas of concern which are the responsibility of the Commission.

October 1966
National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities
of the
National Education Association of the United States
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Table of Contents

	Page
FOREWORD	5
JOINT SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR KENOSHA SCHOOL INVESTIGATION	6
INTRODUCTION	7
The School Board Budget Request	7
Request for an Investigation	7
Preliminary Inquiry	8
Investigation Authorized	8
Subsequent Actions by the School Board, Central Administration, and City Council Prior to the Investigation	8
Council Approves Two New Schools	8
Board Announces Program Cutbacks	9
The Investigation	9
BACKGROUND	10
The Community	10
City and School Government	10
Central Administration of the Public Schools	10
Schools in Kenosha	11
School District Organization and Fiscal Control	11
The Joint City School District	11
The Unified School District in Wisconsin	12
The Unified District Proposal	13
FINDINGS	14
I. Financial Support for Kenosha's Public Schools	14
The Statistics in Perspective	14
Expenditures per Pupil and Pupil-Teacher Ratios	14
Local and Other Support for the Schools	15
Indications of Effort To Support the Schools	15
Indications of Economic Ability	17
Millage and Assessment	17
American Motors Corporation and the Corporate Return Tax (Shared Income Tax)	17
The School Board Budget—Cuts and Increases	19
II. School Board-City Council Relations	22
School Sites	23
The Budget Schedule	23
The Council's Contention	24
The School Board's Contention	25

	Page
III. The Schools and the Community	25
IV. Channels of Communication Within the Schools	25
CONCLUSIONS	27
I. Support for the Schools	27
II. School Board and City Council	28
The Special Responsibilities of a Fiscally Dependent Board of Education	28
The Budget	28
The Council's Responsibility	29
III. The Schools and the Community	30
The Responsibilities of the Administration	30
IV. Channels of Communication Within the Schools	32
RECOMMENDATIONS	33
APPENDIX I: Budget of Kenosha Board of Education Joint District #1, Kenosha, Wisconsin	36
APPENDIX II: Kenosha Board of Education Joint District #1, Detailed Analysis of 1966 Budget Increase of $3,082,079	37

Tables

1. Comparison of Assessed Valuation and Equalized Valuation in Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, and Somers, October 1965	12
2. Per Capita School Expenditures and School Costs Related to Total Municipal Budgets for 40 Fiscally Dependent School Systems in Cities Containing Populations of 50,000 to 99,999	16
3. Indicators of Economic Ability	18
4. Kenosha School Budget and Enrollment	20

Foreword

A good public relations program has been defined as simply following the rules of common courtesy in business and public affairs. The seven-member joint NEA-WEA Special Committee found considerable need for improvement of public relations in Kenosha.

The Special Committee reports that under the system of fiscal dependence in Kenosha, the School Board and the City Council are of necessity in a relationship of great interdependence concerning schools.

However, it further reports that the manner in which the School Board has presented its budget to the Council and the manner in which decreases have been made at the hands of the Council have been sources of continuing controversy in the community and antagonism between the Board and City Council. A source of further aggravation between the City Council and the school administrators was, according to the report, the manner in which the school representatives announced the budget cuts to the public.

The report cites a breakdown of communications on all levels and a subsequent lack of cooperative working relationships—between the schools and the community, the School Board and the City Council, the School Board and the Administration, and the Administration and the teachers.

The Special Committee has made 11 recommendations for bettering the educational climate in Kenosha, not the least important of which are those aimed at informing the citizens of the needs and programs of the schools and those aimed at delineating staff responsibilities and developing up-to-date written personnel policies for the professional staff.

It is hoped that the efforts of the Special Committee will not have been in vain and that the citizens of Kenosha will find the report helpful in improving their schools, because, as the report states, "The schools have a broader purpose than simple service to the local community; they must serve the larger community, the nation."

Cornelius E. Gisriel, *Chairman*
Commission on Professional
Rights and Responsibilities,
National Education Association

Joint Special Committee for Kenosha School Investigation

Appointed by NEA-PR&R Commission:

W. Montfort Barr, *Chairman*	Director, Bureau of School Surveys and Administrative Studies, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
Mrs. G. Theodore Mitau	Member, Board of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota
Mrs. Ruth Trigg	Special Education Teacher, Grove Avenue School, Barrington, Illinois
Robert B. Turner, Jr.	District Superintendent, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida; Member, NEA-PR&R Commission

Appointed by the WEA:

Gerald N. Kongstvedt	Teacher, Washington Park High School, Racine, Wisconsin
Mary Jane McDonald	Principal, Roberts Elementary School, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin
Richard A. Rossmiller	Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Staff Assistants to the Special Committee:

Oscar E. Thompson, *Coordinator*	Associate Executive Secretary, NEA-PR&R Commission
Owen Love	Legal Counsel, NEA-PR&R Commission
Edward Bardill	Field Representative, Wisconsin Education Association
Charles Frailey	Director of Research, Wisconsin Education Association
Patricia K. Veguilla	Technical Writer, NEA-PR&R Commission

Introduction

> As in most communities, our schools are a matter of persistent concern. Our population thrust creates a seemingly endless demand for new or expanded facilities. Teacher turnover, provoked by more affluent and less troubled communities bidding for their services, aggravate our educational purposes. . . .
>
> Although practically all parents are concerned about the education of their children, it is somewhat discouraging to note their rather casual interest in our schools and, indeed, in the workings of local government. Kenosha has not escaped the political indifference that stalks the land and often deprives us of the counsel of our most capable citizens. Only crises seem to evoke interest and then they tend to be loud without light.[1]

The School Board Budget Request

In mid-November 1965, the Kenosha Board of Education presented its full budget request for the fiscal year 1966 to the Kenosha City Council. As of July 1, 1965, the Kenosha city school district had become a "joint city school district" which included the townships of Somers and Pleasant Prairie. The School Board's 1966 budget for the new joint district as presented to the City Council was $11,765,559, a requested increase of $1,576,559 or 15.7 percent over the 1965 combined budgets of Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, and Somers.

In its meeting of November 22, 1965, the Kenosha City Council tentatively cut $800,000 from the total tax to be levied for school purposes and deferred the building of three new schools in the School Board's capital improvement program. The Council had lowered the School Board's requested levy for 1965 by $400,000 and had reduced the 1964 requested levy for school purposes by $200,000.

The School Board responded by voting to send an "emergency letter" on school planning for the coming year to the City Council which pointed out that the city's junior high schools would be beyond capacity in the coming year and that the postponement in the building of the new schools would in all probability necessitate double shifts in one elementary school.

Request for an Investigation

On December 2, 1965, the president of the Kenosha Education Association (KEA) sent a telegram, in triplicate, to the Wisconsin Education Association (WEA), the National Education Association (NEA), and the mayor of Kenosha. The telegram stated,

> This is to notify you that [in] our meeting on December 1, [the] following motion was approved in order to prevent further damage to the

[1] *A City Reports to Its People,* published by the Kenosha News on Tuesday, October 20, 1964, as a message from the Kenosha municipal government to the citizens of Kenosha.

education system of Kenosha through lack of moral and financial support from an apathetic public. "I move we invite WEA and NEA to examine our local school problems and the action of officials of city government relative to public education in Kenosha as a first step toward the possible invocation [of] sanctions." A formal request for an investigation will follow.

The December 2 press report of the KEA meeting stated that "the decision was made . . . because of annual budget cuts forced upon the school system by City Council. . . . Specifically, the action is designed to make the public aware of the teaching staff's extreme concern over the impending double shift on the elementary level as well as the loading of classrooms on all levels." [2]

Preliminary Inquiry

In response to an oral request for an investigation which followed the telegram of December 2, 1965, the WEA conducted a preliminary inquiry into the Kenosha situation. This was followed by another inquiry conducted by the associate executive secretary of the NEA Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities (PR&R Commission).

Investigation Authorized

The reports of the preliminary inquiries, when considered by the NEA-PR&R Commission and the WEA Executive Committee, resulted in the decision in early February to authorize a joint investigation of problems in the Kenosha public schools. A seven-member joint Special Committee composed of two classroom teachers, an elementary school principal, a school board member, a superintendent, and two university professors of education was appointed to conduct the investigation.

Subsequent Actions by the School Board, Central Administration, and City Council Prior to the Investigation

Council Approves Two New Schools. The School Board presented a request for approval by the Council of the construction of a new junior high school and a new elementary school in a session in which it outlined the need for the schools on the basis of the district's enrollment growth. The Council voted on February 17, 1966, to authorize the Board to begin the construction planning. No funds were authorized at the time for either school or for any part of the planning or construction. The authorization of a bond issue for school construction funds requires a three-fourths majority of the Council vote.

---

[2] *Kenosha News*, December 2, 1965.

Board Announces Program Cutbacks. The Central Administration of the Kenosha public schools and the School Board made a re-estimate of the school program for the ensuing year on the basis of the $800,000 decrease in the requested school levy and announced the conclusion that the decrease would necessitate the reduction by one-half of the elementary music, art, and physical education program; the possible elimination of the junior high and high school band programs; and the elimination of the kindergarten, the summer school, and all interscholastic athletic events. The decrease would also, the Board said, prevent the employment of needed additional teaching personnel.

The Monday, February 21, 1966, edition of the *Kenosha News* reported that "school representatives took their budget cut problems to the public at various weekend programs." The director of physical education announced to the patrons at half time of a high school basketball game that "this may be the last time that you will enjoy a Kenosha public school athletic event." Parents and students at an elementary music program heard the music director report on a 50 percent reduction in the elementary music, art, and physical education programs. The coordinator of the athletic department announced at a state wrestling tournament that "the proposed cuts could downgrade the city reputation as a sports town."

The City Council responded by accusing the administrators of using "unethical" means of "arousing school children, parents, and citizens" against the Council.

The Investigation

Such was the status of the Kenosha school controversy when the NEA-WEA Special Committee met in Kenosha on February 23, 24, 25, and 26, 1966. Interviews were held with the mayor, the City Council, the Board of Education, the superintendent of schools, the deputy superintendent and other members of the central administrative staff, members of the Kenosha Education Association Executive Board, members of the Executive Committee of the Kenosha Council of Parent-Teachers Associations, individual teachers and principals, representatives of various community organizations, and other interested citizens. Through these sessions the Committee began its study of Kenosha—the community, the schools, and the controversy.

Background

The Community

Kenosha, Wisconsin, is an industrial center located on the western shore of Lake Michigan, 70 miles north of Chicago. The population, estimated at 72,000 in 1965, is a heterogeneous combination of the descendants of immigrants from the Scandinavian and Southern and Central European countries.

Although there are more than eighty factories in Kenosha manufacturing a variety of products from copperwire, plumbing equipment, and electronic controls to musical instruments and men's underclothing, Kenosha is frequently characterized as a one-industry town. The American Motors Corporation maintains the world's largest automobile assembly plant in Kenosha, provides more than half of the $2,500,000 in shared income taxes the city usually receives as a return from the state, and employs approximately 16,000 people.

In the Kenosha News supplement, *A City Reports to Its People,* issued on October 20, 1964, the city commented on this condition.

> One vexing cross-current is a pervading attitude that stems from our dependence upon a single industry. While Kenosha is justifiably proud of American Motors' achievements in recent years, the scars of leaner years have not fully healed. This attitude is mirrored in the seeming reluctance on the part of newcomers to sink tap roots and the concern of other industry lest the vagaries of the auto market leave them with a tax burden they cannot digest.

City and School Government

The municipal government in Kenosha consists of a mayor elected from the city at large and an 18-member aldermanic council elected by ward, each ward representing approximately 4,000 electors. Each alderman and the mayor must stand for election every two years—the first Tuesday in April of odd-numbered years.

The Kenosha Board of Education consists of seven members elected from the district at large to staggered three-year terms. All municipal and school elections in Kenosha are nonpartisan.

Central Administration of the Public Schools

In addition to the superintendent of schools and the deputy superintendent, the Central Administration includes the offices of curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, pupil services, business affairs, and buildings and grounds, and of the coordinating liaison officer.

The present superintendent was appointed by the School Board 17 years ago.

Schools in Kenosha

The total enrollment in the twenty-nine elementary schools, two special schools, four junior high schools, and two high schools in the new joint district as of September 1965 was 18,539; there were 844 classroom teachers. The enrollment figure that the School Board has projected for September 1966 is 18,830. The Special Committee was told that approximately 43 percent of the Kenosha school age population is enrolled in private or parochial schools.

The Kenosha School of Technology is operated under the Wisconsin Vocational School system and has its own school board. The Vocational School Board is fiscally independent and establishes its own budget, which is not subject to approval by the City Council.

School District Organization and Fiscal Control

The Joint City School District. The Kenosha school system was reorganized from a city school district to a joint city school district on July 1, 1965. The new joint district includes the city of Kenosha and the townships of Somers and Pleasant Prairie.

Wisconsin public school law stipulates that fiscal control of a city school district or joint city school district shall be exercised in the following manner:

> The city council or commission acting with the town chairmen and village presidents shall have the power to approve the school budget, levy the general tax for school purposes, and all other fiscal controls now exercised by the city council over city school districts.
>
> 40.807

The duties and responsibilities of a joint city district school board as specified by the law include an authority to—

> Estimate the expenses of the city schools and prepare a budget; purchase sites for school buildings or other school uses; construct school buildings or additions thereto. *Any action under this subsection shall be submitted to the common council for approval.* [Italics added]
>
> 40.810(9)

> All money appropriated for school purposes shall be under the direction of and shall be expended by the school board.
>
> 40.811 (1)

> The school board shall annually, before October, make an estimate of the expenses of the public schools for the ensuing year, and of the amount which must be raised by city taxation, and shall certify the same to the city clerk who shall lay the same before the common council at its next meeting. *The common council shall consider such estimate and by resolution determine and levy the amount to be raised by city taxation for school purposes for the ensuing year,* which amount shall be included in the annual city budget and be called the "City School Tax." [Italics added]
>
> 40.813 (2)

As far as the Special Committee was able to ascertain, there has been no opinion by a court or interpretation by the attorney general to more clearly delineate or explicate the extent of municipal government control over the school budget than do the above provisions. Certainly, implicit in the power to approve the school budget is the power not to approve it. It is also clear that once the council levies the tax, the determination of expenditure is solely the school board's.

Another provision in the public school law in Wisconsin states that all titles to school buildings and sites in a joint city school district are held by the city rather than by the school board.

The Unified School District in Wisconsin. State law further stipulates that "in a joint city school district a unified school district may be created by petition and referendum of the electors." (40.095)

> The unified school district is a body corporate with the powers to sue and be sued, levy and collect taxes, acquire, hold, and dispose of property, and do all other things reasonable for the performance of its functions in operating a system of public education.
>
> 40.095

In a unified district, the school board is independent and has the right to establish its own budget and levy its own millage within a limit of 17 mills, for current operation purposes, on equalized property valuation. In addition it may levy an amount up to 10 percent of equalized valuation for capital outlay and debt retirement. If the requirement for current operation is in excess of 17 mills, based on the guarantee established by the state legislature ($34,000 per pupil in 1965-66, $38,000 per pupil in 1966-67) the district is considered an excess cost district and must submit the budget to the state Department of Public Instruction. If the budget is then approved, the state is obligated to pay in full any such excess costs.

TABLE 1

Comparison of Assessed Valuation and Equalized Valuation in Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, and Somers, October 1965

	Assessed valuation	*Equalized valuation*	*Percent assessed is of equalized*
1	*2*	*3*	*4*
City of Kenosha	$289,354,390	$454,008,800	63.7%
Pleasant Prairie	37,040,200	50,806,900	72.9
Somers	25,673,815	33,749,500	76.1

The Unified District Proposal

In September 1964, a petition by 10 percent of the electors in Kenosha resulted in a referendum to decide the question of reorganizing Kenosha from a city school district to a unified school district, vesting full fiscal control of the schools in the Board of Education. The City Council, as is required by state law, held the referendum and composed the referendum question which, if voted upon affirmatively by the electorate, would have established a unified school district. The referendum question the Council presented read,

> **Shall the City of Kenosha reorganize its school district with the townships of Pleasant Prairie and Somers as proposed, and create a new taxing unit?**

The question was defeated by a vote of 8,270, No to 6,398, Yes. On July 1, 1965, the reorganization of Kenosha into a joint city school district became effective in place of the proposed reorganization into a unified district.

Findings

I. Financial Support for Kenosha's Public Schools

The Statistics in Perspective

The following statistics relative to financial support for the Kenosha schools are comparative in nature and as such give an accurate picture of the city's support for the schools only insofar as it relates to the support given by other, comparable districts to their schools. The Special Committee studied the statistics relating to Kenosha's school support and compared them with those relating to similar districts; the Committee did not make an in-depth study of Kenosha's school support and compare it with an optimum or ideal situation.

The statistics that follow do not give an indication of the adequacy of Kenosha's school support in terms of its meeting the needs of the specific educational program in Kenosha.

As some of the statistics utilized relating to school expenditure have been supplied by the Research Department of the Wisconsin Education Association, the following inclusion is pertinent:

> *Caution must be used in comparing costs included in this study.* Cost should be related to the depth and quality of the program: a district providing school lunch and/or health programs would have a higher cost per pupil than a district without these programs; a district with multiple units would have a higher operating and maintenance cost than one without multiple units; a district with a teaching staff of long local service would have a higher instruction cost than a district with a teaching staff with short local tenure, etc.
>
> Other factors may influence cost: some school districts provide recreation services as part of the school program, other districts have recreation provided by the municipality; any major expenditure in one year, if allocated in the current operation budget, would be reflected in a disproportionate cost; proportionate number of pupils in elementary and high school would affect the total cost.
>
> There are other factors that would influence any cost analysis, the above emphasizes the necessity of using care in analyzing the figures listed in this study.[3]

Further, the statistics presented below are based upon reports of the 1964-65 school year.

Expenditures per Pupil and Pupil-Teacher Ratios

Kenosha's per pupil-in-average-daily-membership (ADM) current expenditure was $533.18. This ranked eleventh in the state of Wisconsin out of 128 city school districts.[4] Kenosha ranked fifth in per pupil-

[3] Wisconsin Education Association. *Expenditures per Pupil in City Schools 1964-65.* Research Bulletin No. 65-3. Statement of Purpose and Procedure.
[4] *Ibid.*

in-ADM current expenditure among the 23 fiscally dependent districts in Wisconsin that have ADM of more than 3,400, and third among these same districts in operating costs per elementary pupil.[5] The Wisconsin state average per pupil current expenditure for districts of ADM of 2,000 or over was $450.00, or $83.18 less than Kenosha's.[6]

Kenosha's ratio of pupils in ADM to certificated personnel was 18.74 to 1; this is the lowest out of Wisconsin's 23 dependent districts with ADM exceeding 3,400.[7] However, the average elementary class size for the school year 1965-66 was 26.7 pupils. The average class size in the special schools was 11.2, and the junior high school and high school average class sizes were as follows:

Junior High School		*Senior High School*	
Academic	27.1	Academic	26.7
Elective	24.9	Elective	23.3
Activities	34.9	Activities	39.8
Remedial	17.7	Remedial	14.2
Special	11.6	Special	16.0

Local and Other Support for the Schools

The schools in Wisconsin on the average are 68.8 percent supported by local revenue, 23.8 percent supported by state revenue, and 7.4 percent supported by the federal government.[8]

On the other hand, Kenosha's schools are disproportionately supported by local revenues, with 77.7 percent of the school revenues coming from local taxes, 9.81 percent from state aid, and 1.88 percent from federal aid. Receipts from other districts constituted 9.44 percent of the revenues for the 1965 Kenosha school budget.

Indications of Effort To Support the Schools

Table 2 shows comparative statistics indicating the extent of local effort to support the public schools in 40 fiscally dependent school districts in cities with populations of 50,000 to 99,999. Column 2 of this table shows the expenditures for the schools per capita of the total population in each city during 1965. The data indicate that Kenosha ranked fourth highest among the cities in this respect, with a per

---

[5] Public Expenditures Survey of Wisconsin. *Comparative Expenditures of Dependent School Districts—Year Ending June 30, 1965.*

[6] Wisconsin Education Association. Research Bulletin No. 65-3.

[7] Public Expenditures Survey of Wisconsin, *op. cit.*

[8] National Education Association, Research Division. *Rankings of the States, 1966.* Research Bulletin No. 1966-R1. Washington, D.C.: the Association, January 1966.

TABLE 2

Per Capita School Expenditures and School Costs Related to Total Municipal Budgets for 40 Fiscally Dependent School Systems in Cities Containing Populations of 50,000 to 99,999*

City and estimated population	*Cost per capita of population for schools*	*Percent that school expense is of total city expense*	
1	*2*	*3*	
1. Greenwich, Conn. (59,300)	$119.38	52.8%	(8)**
2. Newton, Mass. (96,100)	118.11	47.1	(13)
3. West Hartford, Conn. (69,400)	109.21	58.4	(2)
4. *KENOSHA, WIS. (72,200)*	*94.53*	*55.6*	*(5)*
5. Norwalk, Conn. (74,900)	94.46	56.7	(3)
6. Warwick, R. I. (78,700)	91.04	66.1	(1)
7. Pittsfield, Mass. (59,200)	90.29	41.4	(25)
8. West Allis, Wis. (77,500)	88.97	42.9	(23)
9. Brookline, Mass. (52,400)	87.88	37.8	(27)
10. Wilmington, Del. (90,200)	87.49	45.5	(17)
11. Quincy, Mass. (89,300)	85.72	32.1	(32)
12. Bloomfield, N. J. (53,200)	85.06	56.2	(4)
13. Alexandria, Va. (98,800)	80.28	45.8	(16)
14. Wauwatosa, Wis. (67,200)	79.69	55.4	(6)
15. Green Bay, Wis. (67,800)	77.95	48.4	(12)
16. Waltham, Mass. (57,400)	77.79	37.3	(28)
17. Lynchburg, Va. (57,400)	76.55	49.0	(11)
18. Passaic, N. J. (53,300)	75.14	44.8	(19)
19. Lynn, Mass. (93,200)	73.34	31.2	(34)
20. Meriden, Conn. (55,400)	73.19	49.7	(10)
21. Union, N. J. (50,600)	72.63	45.0	(18)
22. Medford, Mass. (64,300)	72.40	35.3	(30)
23. Portland, Maine (71,100)	71.52	43.8	(20)
24. Malden, Mass. (57,000)	71.32	31.5	(33)
25. Brockton, Mass. (80,900)	69.78	37.8	(27)
26. East Orange, N. J. (76,300)	69.00	42.1	(24)
27. Clifton, N. J. (91,100)	68.77	53.6	(7)
28. Irvington, N. J. (60,200)	67.86	43.7	(22)
29. Holyoke, Mass. (52,400)	67.21	34.3	(31)
30. New Britain, Conn. (74,900)	66.69	46.1	(15)
31. Somerville, Mass. (91,200)	64.31	30.4	(35)
32. Bayonne, N. J. (72,800)	63.53	41.3	(26)
33. Atlantic City, N. J. (58,500)	63.16	26.3	(40)
34. Cranston, R. I. (72,800)	62.71	51.1	(9)
35. Chicopee, Mass. (67,800)	61.28	43.8	(21)
36. Lowell, Mass. (89,800)	60.75	28.1	(37)
37. Pawtucket, R. I. (80,900)	58.63	47.1	(14)
38. Fall River, Mass. (97,400)	54.57	26.7	(38)
39. Lawrence, Mass. (68,900)	46.08	23.8	(40)
40. Manchester, N. H. (91,700)	44.44	36.4	(29)

* Research Division, National Education Association. Educational Research Circular No. 1966-1. January 1966.

** Parenthetical numbers to right represent the descending ranking of percentage that school expense is of total city expense.

capita expenditure of $94.53 compared to an average for all the cities of $75.38. The proportion of total municipal expenditure that is allocated to the schools is shown in Column 3. During 1965, expenditures for public education in Kenosha amounted to 55.6 percent of total city expenditure, fifth highest among the cities. Only nine of the 40 cities in this group spent 50 percent or more of the total city expenditure on the schools.

Indications of Economic Ability

Table 3 indicates the comparative economic ability of the same cities shown in Table 2. The table shows the per capita disposable (effective buying) income, the per household disposable income, and the percent of households in each city in each income group: those with annual disposable income of less than $2,499; those with annual disposable income between $2,500 and $3,999; those with incomes from $4,000 to $6,999; those with incomes from $7,000 to $9,999; and those with annual disposable income of $10,000 or over.

The table indicates that Kenosha ranks fifteenth in per capita disposable income, with $2,535, and fifteenth among the cities in per household disposable income, with $8,357, and that 19.5 percent of the households in Kenosha have annual disposable incomes of less than $4,000 and 24.1 percent of the households have annual disposable incomes of $10,000 or over.

A comparison of Tables 2 and 3 indicates that the three cities that spend a higher per capita amount on the schools than does Kenosha—Greenwich, Connecticut; Newton, Massachusetts; and West Hartford, Connecticut—have per capita and per household disposable incomes from one and one-half to two times higher than Kenosha's.

Millage and Assessment

Kenosha's millage levy is 47 mills on an assessed valuation that is approximately 60.5 percent of true valuation. This means that the property taxes on a home assessed at $10,000 (true valuation of approximately $16,000) come to $470 per annum. Kenosha gets a tax credit from the state of 4 mills. With this credit considered, the total property tax on a home assessed at $10,000 amounts to $430 per annum.

American Motors Corporation and the Corporate Return Tax (Shared Income Tax)

The Special Committee was told that the American Motors Corporation (AMC) employs 16,000 persons in Kenosha and supports approximately 60 to 65 percent of the city's economy.

TABLE 3*

Indicators of Economic Ability

City	Effective buying income		Percent of households by income groups				
	Per capita	Per household	0–$2,499	$2,500–$3,999	$4,000–$6,999	$7,000–$9,999	$10,000 & over
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Brookline, Mass.	$5,422	$15,525	10.4	9.3	23.7	11.2	45.4
2. Greenwich, Conn.	5,346	18,116	7.1	8.2	21.1	12.6	51.0
3. Newton, Mass.	4,483	16,135	7.2	7.5	23.2	12.4	49.7
4. West Hartford, Conn.	4,603	15,289	5.9	5.7	20.5	15.8	52.1
5. Wauwatosa, Wis.	3,653	13,128	6.0	6.3	25.7	19.2	42.8
6. East Orange, N. J.	3,111	8,790	13.0	12.2	32.3	17.4	25.1
7. Norwalk, Conn.	3,090	10,196	9.9	10.9	30.1	16.8	32.3
8. Union, N. J.	2,985	9,795	6.5	7.5	30.0	19.5	36.5
9. Alexandria, Va.	2,934	9,321	12.0	12.0	29.7	10.9	35.4
10. Bloomfield, N. J.	2,888	8,984	7.8	9.3	32.7	19.8	30.4
11. Clifton, N. J.	2,673	8,574	8.7	9.7	35.0	20.2	26.4
12. Irvington, N. J.	2,635	7,481	12.4	12.8	35.9	18.8	20.1
13. Quincy, Mass.	2,602	8,607	11.1	12.0	35.3	15.8	25.8
14. Meriden, Conn.	2,540	8,181	11.0	12.9	37.1	17.8	21.2
15. KENOSHA, WIS.	*2,535*	*8,357*	*10.4*	*9.1*	*37.6*	*18.8*	*24.1*
16. Waltham, Mass.	2,490	9,342	10.3	12.1	35.9	15.2	26.5
17. New Britain, Conn.	2,540	8,096	11.8	14.1	35.9	17.8	20.4
18. Medford, Mass.	2,468	8,718	11.1	12.8	35.0	15.0	26.1
19. Cranston, R. I.	2,454	8,671	13.2	13.7	36.0	12.6	24.5
20. Passaic, N. J.	2,452	7,262	17.7	15.9	33.9	15.4	17.1
21. Wilmington, Del.	2,440	7,614	18.7	17.8	30.9	13.3	19.3
22. Holyoke, Mass.	2,439	7,389	17.9	17.2	35.1	12.8	17.0
23. Brockton, Mass.	2,381	7,555	15.5	16.7	37.0	13.4	17.4
24. Lynn, Mass.	2,378	7,315	17.1	15.3	35.2	13.7	18.7
25. Malden, Mass.	2,359	7,684	14.4	14.3	37.3	15.0	26.1
26. Portland, Maine	2,358	7,166	15.1	23.2	30.8	15.3	15.6
27. Warwick, R. I.	2,329	8,183	12.6	13.2	37.3	13.4	23.5
28. Bayonne, N. J.	2,315	7,559	13.0	14.0	34.9	17.1	21.0
29. West Allis, Wis.	2,314	7,731	8.3	9.9	40.1	21.3	20.4
30. Manchester, N. H.	2,258	7,215	15.9	19.1	35.0	15.6	14.4
31. Lynchburg, Va.	2,224	7,599	22.9	17.1	31.7	9.3	19.0
32. Pawtucket, R. I.	2,206	6,735	19.1	18.1	36.1	10.8	15.9
33. Somerville, Mass.	2,183	7,319	14.2	15.4	38.3	14.0	18.1
34. Lowell, Mass.	2,156	6,965	18.4	17.5	35.2	12.5	16.4
35. Chicopee, Mass.	2,100	7,655	13.3	14.9	38.2	15.0	18.6
36. Lawrence, Mass.	2,066	6,384	21.7	17.4	34.9	12.7	13.3
37. Green Bay, Wis.	2,015	6,936	14.3	16.5	39.5	16.0	13.7
38. Fall River, Mass.	2,002	6,151	24.0	21.4	34.7	10.1	9.8
39. Atlantic City, N. J.	1,924	5,438	35.3	22.1	24.9	9.2	8.5
40. Pittsfield, Mass.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Figures compiled by NEA–PR&R Staff from *Sales Management*. Survey of Buying Power. June 10, 1965.

In past years the city's share of the state corporate profit tax paid by AMC has been as high as $1,200,000. In 1966 the city anticipated receiving no corporate return from AMC.

Another serious drain on the city's economy has occurred in that AMC has had one strike and two lay-offs in 1965 and 1966. The Special Committee was told that following the first lay-off, 2,400 persons were not re-employed.

The School Board Budget—Cuts and Increases

The Special Committee was told that the Council has habitually cut the School Board's budget requests. In spite of these "cuts," the school budgets finally granted by the Council from 1953 to 1965 have shown an average annual increase of 10 percent, ranging from a decrease of 6.4 percent in 1954 to an increase of 18.3 percent in 1960 (see Table 4).

The City Council's "cuts" in the School Board's budget requests have taken a geometric progression in the past three years: $200,000 in 1964; $400,000 in 1965; and $800,000 in 1966. However, of the $200,000 cut by the Council from the 1964 proposal, $137,750 were later supplied to the School Board by a special appropriation from the city giving a total increase in *budget granted* over the 1963 budget of $683,317, or 9.7 percent. The following year, the year of the $400,000 cut, the budget granted had a percentage increase, after the cut, over the 1964 budget of 12.8 percent. The School Board spent $126,000 more than they received in 1965, so that the actual expenditure for 1965 increased 14.2 percent over that of 1964. The School Board's 1966 budget request contained an increase of $1,576,559 over the combined 1965 budgets of Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, and Somers, which now constitute the joint district. This was a request for a 15.7 percent increase over the three combined 1965 budgets.

The Council cut the School Board's 1966 budget request by $800,000. This left an increase in budget granted of $776,559 over the combined 1965 budgets of Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, and Somers, an increase of 7.6 percent. Furthermore, on March 14, 1966, the City Council made a special appropriation of $123,000 to the School Board's 1966 budget, giving a total increase over the combined 1965 budgets of $899,559, or 9 percent.

At the time of the Council's $800,000 decrease in the levy requested by the School Board and before the $123,000 appropriation, the superintendent of schools and several School Board members made a statement to the press to the effect that with the Council's $800,000 cut, although it appeared that the schools still had an increase of $776,559 over the 1965 combined budgets, $810,115 of the increase requested in the 1966 budget was encumbered—that is, contracted for and there-

TABLE 4

Kenosha School Budget and Enrollment*

Year	*Total school enrollment*	*Percent of change*	*Budget granted*	*Percent of change*
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1953	9,420		$2,728,376	
		2.7		14.8
1954	9,677		3,128,508	
		4.9		−6.4
1955	10,159		2,940,656	
		−0.67		11.2
1956	10,092		3,268,941	
		3.5		3.0
1957	10,442		3,382,798	
		5.5		11.2
1958	10,977		3,761,623	
		3.9		15.5
1959	11,405		4,349,759	
		3.1		12.5
1960	11,762		4,887,243	
		6.7		18.3
1961	12,548		5,793,577	
		6.2		9.5
1962	13,321		6,344,550	
		4.3		10.4
1963	13,894		7,009,539	
		5.4		9.7
1964	14,648		7,692,856	
		6.2		12.8
1965	15,554		8,683,480	

ANNUAL AVERAGE INCREASE IN ENROLLMENT: 4.3 percent
TOTAL INCREASE IN ENROLLMENT: 6,134 or 64.8 percent
ANNUAL AVERAGE INCREASE IN BUDGET GRANTED: 10.2 percent
TOTAL INCREASE IN BUDGET GRANTED: $5,955,104 or 218.5 percent

In 1966, with the addition of Pleasant Prairie and Somers to the district, the enrollment increase was 20 percent while the budget granted increased 28.7 percent.

* These figures were supplied by the WEA. The 1964 budget grant amount does not agree with the amount listed by the Kenosha Board of Education in its budget request for 1965. (See Appendix I)

fore fixed—so that the schools were actually going to have to operate on approximately $45,000 less than the previous year. Among these encumbered or "fixed" increases in expenditure included in the statement were "increases in debt service, regular increments, new personnel, salary adjustments negotiated last year, retirement, social security, and insurance." If this were indeed the case, the special appropriation from the city of $123,000 would only have furnished an increase of $89,444 over the combined 1965 budgets for growth.

The combined 1965 budgets of Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, and Somers amounted to $10,189,000. The Kenosha city budget was $8,683,520 of this, and the budget of the two townships was $1,505,520. An analysis of the Kenosha School Board's 1966 budget request for the joint school district indicates, insofar as is discernible, that of the $11,765,559 requested for the joint district, $1,305,446 (including debt service), was for expenditure on Pleasant Prairie and Somers—*$200,000 less than was expended on them last year.*[9] One of the main purposes of the consolidation of school districts is, of course, the increased economy of operation that results. This indicates further that of the $11,765,559 request, $10,460,113 were allocated to city expenditure. Assuming that all of the Council's final $677,000 cut was taken from that portion of the budget allocated to the city, the city received a $1,109,705, or 12 percent, increase over the 1965 city budget. Of the $1,305,446 of the budget request that is designated for the two townships, $81,500 is the *increase* in payment of principal on the debt over 1965 (the full payment of principal on the debt is $114,500) and $44,163 is the *increase* of interest on the township's debt over 1965 (full interest due is $51,771). Therefore, of the $810,115 in "fixed charges" mentioned by the superintendent and Board members to be taken from the increase in funds over 1965, $125,663 is clearly assignable to that part of the budget allocated to the two townships. Therefore, assuming that the balance of the "fixed charges," $684,452, had to be taken from the city's portion of the budget increase, the city would be left, after the Council's final cut of $677,000, with an in-

---

[9] See Appendix II, "Detailed Analysis of 1966 Budget Increase of $3,082,079."

It will be noted that in arriving at the figure for budget increase for 1966, the School Board compared its 1966 budget request for the joint district, not with the combined 1965 budgets of Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie, and Somers, but with the 1965 budget for the city alone. Therefore, included in its figure for the total increase over the 1965 budget is not only the projected increase in expenditure on the city schools and the projected increase in expenditure on the other township (county) schools, but also the total expenditure on the county schools. The figures in this appendix that are labeled "county" represent the combination of last year's base figure of expenditure and whatever increase or decrease is being effectuated in the 1966 budget.

crease of $424,590 over last year's budget that can be considered unencumbered and purely for growth purposes. This amount represents a 4.8 percent increase over the 1965 budget for growth. This is $168,988 less than the Board requested, exclusive of the $350,000 set aside for wage adjustments yet to be negotiated.

It must be noted, however, that the above calculations may be somewhat lacking in accuracy, as they were based upon the School Board's 1966 budget request, in which the categories separating the city expenditure from amounts to be expended on the townships are not clearly defined.

II. School Board-City Council Relations

Under the system of fiscal dependence in Kenosha, the School Board and the City Council are of necessity involved in a relationship of great interdependence concerning the schools. The Board is dependent upon the Council for the funds to execute the school program, and the Council is dependent upon the School Board for accurate information about the schools, their needs and goals, in order to make an adequate determination of the funds to be appropriated. The School Board's budget is one means by which this information must be transmitted to the Council. The school budget, the manner of its presentation by the Board, and the manner of its decreases at the hands of the Council, have been sources of continuing controversy in the community and antagonism between the Board and City Council.

While everyone with whom the Special Committee spoke acknowledged that there exists a severe conflict between the School Board and the Council and many attributed this conflict to a matter of personalities, a great number expressed the view that the conflict is a direct result of the system of fiscal dependence and will continue as long as that system continues. Such views are typified in remarks such as—

> Here is a situation of two popularly-elected bodies, both feeling a mandate from the people and both simply trying to do a good job: the Council has the responsibility for the entire city and the School Board is trying to run good schools. The problem is with fiscal dependence; the Board can only recommend the budget and the Council feels that it should express itself on what kind of school program the town should have. The Board feels the Council is not qualified to do that and the Council feels the Board is not fiscally responsible.

More important to the study, however, is an examination of the cooperation and conflict of the School Board and the Council under the present system, the manner in which the School Board meets its responsibilities to the Council, and the manner in which the Council exercises its authority over the Board; in other words, the manner in

which both bodies are fulfilling their proper roles under the system of fiscal dependence.

School Sites

As is specified in Wisconsin school law, all school construction and selection of sites in a joint city school district is subject to approval by the Council. The Council can effectively veto any selection the Board makes of a site for school construction by refusing to authorize the bond issue for site purchase and school construction. The Special Committee was told that because of a difference of opinion between the Board and the Council about a proposed site for construction of a high school, there was a delay of two years in the construction of the building, necessitating a double shift in the existing high school. Rancor over this conflict apparently still exists in Kenosha.

The Budget Schedule

The Special Committee was told that the School Board is habitually late with its budget request; it has factual evidence that this is true of the 1965 and 1966 budgets. In the fall of 1965, after requesting and receiving from the Council a two-week extension beyond the statutory October 1 deadline, the Board on October 15 submitted to the Finance Committee of the Council a request for $11,765,559 on two sheets of paper containing base figures alone. On the basis of the two pages of base figures, the Finance Committee of the Council recommended to the Council a decrease in the requested levy of $600,000.

The Special Committee was told that about two months before the budget proposals were due, the mayor spoke to the School Board, the County Board, and the various municipal departments about the city's decreased financial ability for the coming year due to the anticipated loss in corporate return taxes from American Motors Corporation. The Council and mayor stressed the importance of keeping the total millage increase for fiscal 1966 to a limit of 2.62 mills. It was evidently intended that the schools would be allocated 55.65 percent of this millage increase, the same as its allotment for the previous year. The $600,000 decrease in the School Board's requested levy recommended by the Finance Committee of the Council was commensurate with this intention.

After the Finance Committee's recommendation, however, the County Board presented the Council with the tax bill for the county, which was considerably higher than the Council had anticipated in spite of the mayor's entreaties for frugality. The City Council has no option but to pay the county tax bill in full as it is presented.

The Council requested that the School Board supply each alderman an itemization of the budget request, of which, until that time, they

had seen only the base figures. A motion by one Board member that the Board comply with the Council's request was defeated, and the Board wrote the Council a letter refusing to supply the itemization but informing the aldermen that such a breakdown was in the Central Administration offices and available for them to study there.

The Council received the School Board's final budget request on or about November 15, 1965, and held its final budget hearing on November 22, 1965.

On November 22, the Council voted unanimously to extend the recommended decrease of $600,000 in the School Board's requested levy to $800,000 in order to compensate for the loss of funds to the county.

After the Council's action, the School Board made the announcement to the public that the cut would necessitate the loss in services and extracurricular activities, and approved the similar announcements from the three administrators, mentioned in the introductory section of this report. The Board had not at that time approached the Council with a request for a supplementary appropriation.

In previous years, the Special Committee was told, the Board has announced to the public that the Council's cut in the school budget request would have to be taken in some of these sensitive areas, there has been a corresponding outcry from the public, and the Council has appropriated some additional funds. And, in fact, as was noted earlier, the Council did authorize the Board to begin the initial steps in planning for two additional school buildings that had been eliminated from the capital improvement program, although no funds were approved, and did appropriate $123,000 to the School Board on March 14, 1966.

The Council's Contention

The Council maintains, "The School Board's budget request is impossible to read. The Board gives no explanation of its figures and the figures it gives are not always consistent." Because of this lack of explanation of the figures in the request and because the request is submitted late, the Council feels that it has insufficient time and insufficient information to study the School Board budget properly or to make an adequate assessment of it in order to approve or cut it in an informed manner.

The Council believes that the School Board submits a padded budget, a suspicion that is intensified by the Board's refusal to supply a more complete breakdown of its request and its failure to explain and justify the requested increase. The Council bitterly resents the Board's public announcements to the children and parents of the loss of desired programs before seeking appropriations, with proper justification of the need for the funds, from the Council itself.

The School Board's Contention

The School Board resents the Council's desire to see a more detailed budget and believes that were it to supply one the Council would cut funds specified for particular items in the school program that it doesn't understand or approve. The Board told the Special Committee that in the past it has submitted what it believed to be itemized budget requests to the Council only to have the aldermen seize upon one or two items of expenditure and misinterpret them. The Council's desire to see a more detailed budget, the Board feels, is an example of unwarranted interference into the administration and policy making of the school system by a body that is not expert in determining the needs of an educational program. A minority opinion on the Board of Education is that it is the responsibility of the Board to supply the Council with whatever information it believes it needs in order to make a proper evaluation of the budget request.

The School Board is of the sincere opinion that it submits a budget that is accurate and justified in terms of the educational needs of the community.

III. The Schools and the Community

The school system has no well organized plan or program for informing the public about the total educational program, the overall educational goals, the schools' needs, and the schools' problems. There is no staff in the Central Administration office charged with the responsibility of coordinating a program of public relations and information. The Administration does not meet with the parent-teachers associations, community organizations, or citizens groups for the express purpose of explaining the school budget and the need for the funds requested. The school system does not issue an annual report to the public.

IV. Channels of Communication Within the Schools

Perhaps the problem in Kenosha that was most universally troubling to the people with whom the Special Committee spoke was a "breakdown of communications on all levels" and the subsequent lack of cooperative working relationships—between the schools and the community, the School Board and the City Council, the School Board and the Administration, and the Administration and the teachers.

Following is testimony that is illustrative of this belief:

> "The public is not aware of the seriousness of the schools' financial straits; in past years, even the teachers didn't know where the cuts were."

"The channels of communication within the school system itself are terrible; an order from the top gets changed at each step down."

"In this town, communications are a weak point; they could definitely be better between the Administration and the teachers."

"The communication is so bad, all I know is what I read in the papers. If an item a teacher has requested is cut from the budget, we're never told; we just sit and wait for the item to arrive. We don't know if the item has been cut, or just hasn't come yet, or is sitting in a storeroom somewhere."

"The channels of communication within the school system are all verbal; the policy is not written. The last Board and Administration policy manual came out in 1954; it has not been revised since. In the manual are some 528 resolutions, some of the later ones cancelling some of the earlier ones—but it is not organized, so you have to wade through the whole thing."

"There is no clearly delineated policy of Board and administrative responsibilities; consequently, there is some Board interference in administrative functions."

"The principals are very limited in what they can communicate to the staff. The principals have meetings and receive some information from the Central Administration but are told not to release it. The teachers and the public don't know what is going on. This creates a very low teacher morale."

"At the Board of Education budget hearings, no one speaks up to correct the fallacies and misinformation that are being perpetrated in the minds of the Council and the public. The Board members are either not sufficiently well-versed to do so, or don't care to. This is part of the communications problem with the community."

Conclusions

The NEA-WEA Special Committee found many things to admire in relation to the public schools of Kenosha. It appears that Kenosha children are receiving above-average educational opportunities. In spite of its failure to support the total budget requests of the School Board, the City Council has consistently made available funds for the schools that compare well with those of other communities. The School Board deserves commendation for its recognition that schools must be continually improved and the educational program steadily expanded to meet the needs of young people if they are to cope successfully with the increasing complexities of today's society.

I. Support for the Schools

The Special Committee found the feeling to be widespread in Kenosha, among the citizenry as well as among the teaching and administrative staff of the school system, that the cuts in the School Board's budget proposal by the City Council, over the past three years in particular, had greatly damaged the educational system in Kenosha and would affect its quality in the future.

It can be concluded from the statistics presented earlier that the Kenosha schools are *comparatively* well supported, and that the Kenosha City Council is making more of an effort in behalf of the schools than 35 of the 40 other municipal bodies that have fiscal control of the schools in the fiscally dependent school districts in cities with populations between 50,000 and 99,999. How well the schools are supported on an absolute scale or an optimum scale is undetermined and cannot be determined from the statistics presented earlier. The Special Committee is aware that a school district may receive support that compares very favorably with that received by other districts and still not be adequately supported. It is possible that the 10 percent annual average increase in school budget granted by the Council is not sufficient to sustain and continually improve the program that is necessary or desirable for Kenosha. It may not be adequate to fulfill the goal of excellence that Kenosha has for its schools.

If the financial support the schools receive is not adequate to meet the needs of the educational program, the School Board and Administration would be well advised to make the needs of that program better known to the public, the teachers, and the City Council—for it is impossible to make a value judgment upon the adequacy of the support to meet the goals of a school system when the goals are not known.

The Special Committee has not seen persuasive evidence that the Council's action relative to support for the schools has, in and of itself, damaged the educational program in Kenosha. If indeed there

are actual inadequacies in some areas of the school program, it is possible that they are not the result of insufficient support from the city but may have other causes, to be found perhaps in such areas as administrative organization, equality (or inequality) of distribution of resources among the schools, efficiency and modernity of the business operation, or placement of emphasis among the various programs and consequent allocation of the available funds. If there are inadequacies, their causes may be found in all of these areas, none of these areas, or a combination of them. The Special Committee suggests that these areas be examined before all of the blame for whatever lacks there are in the schools is attached to insufficient financial effort by the city.

The Special Committee believes that the School Board has a responsibility to the community as a whole to determine the kind of educational program that is the optimum possible for Kenosha while taking into consideration the community's ability to support such a program.

The system of fiscal dependence imposes certain rigid responsibilities upon a school board to provide complete assurance to its community, and specifically to its city council, that the support the schools receive is being well spent.

II. School Board and City Council

The Special Responsibilities of a Fiscally Dependent Board of Education

The Special Committee has concluded that the Kenosha School Board has not met adequately in various respects its responsibilities to the City Council imposed by the system of fiscal dependence.

The Budget

The Special Committee does not consider the Council's desire to see a more detailed school budget than it has thus far received to be an example of "unwarranted interference into the administration of the school system." The Committee agrees with the City Council that the School Board's final budget request was thoroughly inadequate in terms of an explanation of the figures and interpretability.

The final School Board budget request for fiscal 1966 consists of 49 pages of unexplained figures. The budget contains no explanation of the educational program, no statement of the specific goals of the educational program in Kenosha, and no justification whatever for the requested increase. The only philosophical statement that would give the community or the city government a rationale for accepting the School Board's budget requests is a single, brief, abstract para-

graph about the general value of education written by the superintendent and appearing on the cover of the proposal.

The Special Committee does not recommend that the Board submit to the Council the principals' requisitions, the administrative working papers, or an item-by-item breakdown that would show each piece of chalk and pencil sharpener needed. Such a detailed itemizing of the schools' needs for the Council would be as unproductive as the two pages of base figures submitted on October 15, 1965, for it would be virtually uninterpretable by a lay body and would lend itself to great misinterpretation. An adequate expenditure budget request should include a statement of the general objectives of the school program, a statement of the specific objectives for the coming year, a description of each program that would constitute an area of increased expenditure, a justification of each such program, and a statement of the funds necessary to meet the needs of each program.

The Special Committee believes that were the Council to receive a budget request wherein it felt that the figures given were adequately explained and the requested increases adequately justified, it would be unlikely to find any necessity to ask for a line breakdown. The Committee also believes, however, that a system of fiscal dependence imposes a special responsibility upon a school board to supply a city council, or similar governmental agency, with the necessary information to make a proper determination of the tax levy and the total city expenditure.

The burden of responsibility for making the community aware of the schools' needs lies with the School Board and the Administration of the school system. A municipal body that must consider the overall needs of the total community can hardly be blamed for its lack of sympathy for school needs when its members are uninformed as to what those needs are. By the School Board's and the Administration's own charge, the City Council does not have the specific expertise to determine the needs of an educational program in Kenosha; yet it is the Council that must determine the amount of money to be spent to meet those needs. Who is going to supply the expertise necessary for the Council to make its determination in an informed, intelligent, sympathetic manner if not the School Board and, most particularly, the Administration of the school system?

The Council's Responsibility

Theoretically, in a system in which the school board is fiscally dependent upon the city council, the position of the council should be that of an impartial arbiter among the various special interests of the community. The council must view the total community picture, having as its chief responsibility the service of the residents of the com-

munity. It is the role, and in fact the duty, of the special interest departments to advocate their position to the council, to convince it that the service they can render the community is vital and deserves as large a portion of the community financial resources as they feel is needed to maintain their service or to improve it. Theoretically, the council is in a position to be persuaded in favor of a particular department's needs and is not deflected by personal interests or desires for personal gain or power from its fundamental function of serving the public.

The schools, however, are in a unique position among the special interest departments in that not only is the future of the community's children in their hands, but also the future of American democracy. The schools have a broader purpose than simple service to the local community; they must serve the larger community, the nation. For this reason, the schools must be given what may seem to some to be disproportionate consideration among the various community services. The schools, above all, cannot be allowed to become the focal point for political infighting and the victim of petty personality differences between governmental bodies or agencies.

The municipal body that has the fiscal authority over the schools must give weighted consideration to educational needs. For the Council to arbitrarily set the millage increase before giving itself the opportunity to be apprised and persuaded of the schools' needs is not to be fully responsible. For the Council to allow personality conflict with the Board of Education to influence its judgment about the education of Kenosha's children is not to be responsible.

III. The Schools and the Community

The Responsibilities of the Administration

It must be remembered that the Board of Education is a lay body and does not consist of persons professionally trained in educational administration. The Central Administration does consist of professional educators and is therefore the group that is most likely to be knowledgeable in techniques of school budget preparation and related public relations procedures. The Administration is not giving the full measure of its professional training in assistance to the Board of Education in the preparation of an adequate budget request or the formulation of an adequate program of public relations and information.

> Good school-community relations require active, aggressive leadership on the part of the school superintendent and his staff. They further require the participation, policy development, and support of the school board, as the important intermediaries between the schools and the community. The school staff and school board are the educational leaders of

the community, and school-community relations are matters of educational leadership. This does not mean that leadership should function in a vacuum; leadership presupposes the ability to listen and be responsive to other group leaders.[10]

Neal Gross has defined educational leadership as follows:

(1) The ability to influence a school staff and the community to raise its educational goals.
(2) The ability to get the professional staff and community to work together in developing an educational philosophy and set educational goals that will provide a firm basis for developing school policies and programs.
(3) The ability to work effectively with the staff to accomplish these objectives.
(4) The ability to convince the community and its key opinion leaders of the need to provide sufficient funds for the schools.[11]

The School Board is in a position of having to compete for the public dollar against other public interests. The School Board and Administration have a responsibility to keep continually in the public awareness the fact that the schools in Kenosha belong to the people of Kenosha and constitute the hope of their children's futures to live in a world in which yesterday's skills are obsolete. The School Board and Administration have a responsibility to remind the people that they need the schools and that the schools can only meet the needs of their children if they are adequately supported.

The Special Committee was unable to find that either the School Board or the School Administration has made effective efforts to inform the people of Kenosha about their schools, their financial needs and problems, and the goals of the educational program.

One of the most generally agreed-upon major goals of education is to foster the development of children into responsible citizens, meaningfully involved in their community and in the government process on local, state, and national levels. Little real enthusiasm for community involvement is likely to be engendered in the children in a classroom if the schools themselves are not involved in a meaningful dialogue with the community.

A cooperative, mutually responsive relationship between the city and its schools is highly desirable and important under any circumstances; under the system of fiscal dependence, it is essential.

> There are obstacles to the development of a high measure of joint action [between the city and the schools]. Some are technical and can be solved. . . . Others arise from human frailties and cannot be solved but only

---

[10] Suburban Area Study Group, Montgomery County, Md. *The Schools and the Community—A Communications Study.* Silver Spring, Md.: the Study Group, July 1966.
[11] Gross, Neal. *Who Runs Our Schools.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.

meliorated. Among these is the organization's ancient quest for power and status: the city's jealous protection of its prerogatives, the schools' apprehension lest by accepting assistance it appear to confess weakness. What is required are certain personal qualities on the part of the mayor and the city council on the one hand and the superintendent and school board on the other: the dedication to the public weal to inspire, the imagination to identify opportunities for, the good will to work toward constructive arrangements. The secret to positive operational relations between cities and schools is not legal mandate but personal commitment.[12]

IV. Channels of Communication Within the Schools

The Special Committee finds the testimony it received concerning the channels of communication within the school system to indicate considerable failure on the part of the School Board and the Administration to inform and enlighten the teaching staff.

The teachers appear to be making meaningful efforts to inform themselves about the schools' financial needs and problems, but obviously, they do not have access to the data necessary to make completely valid evaluations or to discover critical weaknesses and omissions in the financial structure where they exist.

The absence of any adequate information service from the schools to the community and the lack of communications within the schools creates a fertile field for the spread of rumors, misinformation, and half-truths; tends to foster an unhealthy morale among the teaching staff; and results in a dangerous lack of understanding and confidence between the schools and the public.

The Special Committee found the Board of Education and Administration Policies Manual to be lacking in clarity, cohesion, and coherence and urges that the writing, organizing, and publicizing of the Board of Education policies and procedures and the clear delineation of the areas of Board and administrative responsibility be given top priority.

---

[12] Martin, Roscoe C. *Government and the Suburban School.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962. p. 74.

Recommendations

The fact that this report of the Special Committee places strong emphasis on certain weaknesses seemingly apparent on the part of the Board and Central Administration should not be used to infer that the Kenosha City Council was not remiss in some of its actions. Although this report cites several broad areas in which the Council might have chosen to act more wisely, the Special Committee has focused its recommendations on matters directly concerned with improving and strengthening those functions of the Board and Central Administration which would improve the climate for education in the City of Kenosha.

The intention behind the Special Committee's criticism of the School Board and Central Administration stems from the basic belief that the profession of education in our society is expected to engender public understanding of its role and create a public understanding which engenders the strong support of its purpose. Specifically this basic belief is stated thus in the Charter of the WEA PR&R Commission:

> C. . . .; Public Responsibility involves action by the Commission itself to help create a climate of information and attitude, both within the profession and the general public, which will aid the profession of teaching in the mutual improvement of its members and the advancement of public education throughout the state. . . .[13]

After long consideration through several meetings held after the actual Kenosha investigation, the Special Committee expressed a consensus that in all fairness it could not increase the scope of its assessment of the Council's actions beyond that now stated in the report without a much more extensive and detailed analysis of both the municipal government and the entire educational institution in Kenosha. The Special Committee presents its analyses and recommendations chiefly as guides to the School Board and Central Administration to strengthen their position in the community in general, and specifically their relationship with the City Council, insofar as this is possible under the system of fiscal dependency inherent in the Joint School District.

The Special Committee's report should be viewed as a positive attempt to improve the educational climate in Kenosha and thereby to help the profession as a whole to increase its ability to develop among its members and the general public a better understanding of the issues and problems of education.

The Special Committee found that the community of Kenosha has a vital interest in its schools and supports them reasonably well

---

[13] WEA Professional Practices Committee Report. November 4, 1965. p. 2.

both financially and generally. However, the lack of a strong, positive program of public information has permitted an unwarranted contention over school expense to occur. This contention drew the schools into the political arena and has caused a distortion of the position of education as a primary resource of the community. The lack of understanding of the program and needs of the schools has beclouded the real purpose of education by unduly emphasizing necessary economic demands instead of developing an educational program suitable for the needs of Kenosha's children.

The Special Committee believes that as long as a system of fiscal dependency requires a continued interrelationship between the School Board and the City Council, it is essential that an attitude of cooperation be achieved or both the Board and Council will suffer, and, eventually, the entire community will also be damaged.

The following specific steps are recommended for the betterment of the educational climate in Kenosha:

1. The destructive criticism between the agencies of schools and community and the buck-passing of responsibility for the educational program in Kenosha must cease.
2. The Central Administration must assume full responsibility for determining what funds are needed to support a quality education program. Requests for funds must be supported by adequate and understandable statements of needs and objectives of the educational program. Serious consideration should be given to cooperative involvement of community leaders knowledgeable in fiscal matters and concerned with the educational needs of the school district in developing procedures, means, and materials that will result in more widespread and informed support for the schools. Certainly the future advance of Kenosha's public schools depends in large degree upon the development of a more readily understandable budget and more effective procedures for informing the public and the Council of the increasing needs of the schools.
3. The School Board should engage the professional services of recognized specialists to make an in-depth study of the financial needs and resources of the school district.
4. The School Board should issue to the public a formal annual report concerning important aspects of the educational program.
5. A full-time public relations specialist with adequate secretarial assistance should be appointed to the Central Administration staff.
6. Written policies of the School Board and professional staff should be carefully examined in light of current problems in

staff-administration-board relationships. This should be a cooperative venture in which the teaching staff, the Central Administration, and the School Board are represented.

7. The School Administration should develop policies and plans to clearly delineate staff responsibility for the school program. The teachers should be involved in the development of policies subject to approval by the School Board. The leadership responsibility of the administrative staff should be more clearly evident in all phases of the school program.
8. A representative committee of citizens and officials should examine alternatives and make recommendations for the reorganization of the present school district.
9. The City Council should take upon itself its proper share of responsibility for fostering an atmosphere for the development of mutual respect between the schools and the community. It should recognize and respect the judgment of school personnel in making educational decisions. The mayor and City Council should not arbitrarily establish the tax levy for school purposes before reviewing the school budget. The City Council should be at least as concerned about the education of Kenosha's children as about the tax rate. The taxpayers in Kenosha stand to benefit far more from having quality education for the community's children than from having the millage kept down.
10. The School Administration should provide opportunities for the teachers to serve on committees to formulate the budget and school policies. The teachers, in turn, must assume personal responsibility for keeping informed about all aspects of the school operation.
11. The Kenosha Education Association should continue to strengthen its efforts to provide professional leadership and increased services to its members. It should keep its members informed by seeking and transmitting information about School Board, City Council, and other actions affecting them. The KEA showed initiative in seeking the aid of the state and national associations to examine the educational problems in Kenosha. It should show similar initiative in efforts to win renewed public confidence in and support for the schools.

The Special Committee expresses the hope that its efforts will contribute to the achievement of a stronger cooperative effort between the School Board and the City Council, the Central Administrative Staff and the rest of the professional staff, and within the professional staff itself.

Appendix I

Budget of Kenosha Board of Education Joint District #1
Kenosha, Wisconsin

	1965 Budget	*1966 Budget*	*Amount of Increase or Decrease (D)*	*Percent of Increase or Decrease (D)*
EXPENDITURES				
Salaries	$6,388,345	$ 7,856,354	$1,468,009	23.0%
Supplies	1,193,158	1,737,073	543,915	45.6
Capital Outlay	48,930	216,616	167,686	342.7
Debt Service	1,053,047	1,605,516	552,469	52.5
Provision for Wage Adjustments	.....	350,000	350,000	.....
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$8,683,480	$11,765,559	$3,082,079	35.5
REVENUES				
Estimated Cash Surplus	$ 37,835	.....	$ 37,835 (D)	....
Undetermined Revenue	66,735	.....	66,735 (D)	....
Other Receipts	1,620,829	2,109,959	489,130	30.2
Tax Levy—Other Than Debt	5,913,331	8,050,084	2,136,753	36.1
Tax Levy—Debt Service	1,044,750	1,605,516	560,766	53.7
TOTAL REVENUES	$8,683,480	$11,765,559	$3,082,079	35.5

ENROLLMENT STATISTICS	*Senior High*	*Junior High*	*Elementary & Specials*	*Total*
Sept. 1962	2,822	2,801	7,699	13,322
Sept. 1963	3,084	2,967	7,843	13,894
Sept. 1964	3,447	3,072	8,129	14,648
Sept. 1965	3,638	3,295	11,606	18,539
Sept. 1966 (Estimated)	3,625	3,405	11,800	18,830

Appendix II

Kenosha Board of Education Joint District #1
Detailed Analysis of 1966 Budget
Increase of $3,082,079

SALARIES (1,818,009)

1. *Annual Increments (All Employees)*		133,091
2. *Less Amount for Staff Turnover*		(10,675)
3. *Personnel added this year* (full year in 1966 Budget as against part of year in 1965)		
a. Administrative Clerk—Personnel	4,067	
b. Data Processing Programer	5,900	
c. Supervisors—Safety	5,700	
d. Teachers—7½	18,600	
e. Custodial	1,699	35,966
4. *Personnel from Attached Districts*		
a. Administrator—County Liaison ½	5,225	
b. Clerical—County Liaison ½	3,175	
c. Principals—Certificated—3	33,109	
d. Principal's Clerks—7	27,083	
e. Elementary Teachers—118	672,909	
f. Noon Lunch	6,300	
g. Custodial	78,640	
h. Transportation Supervisor ½	5,225	
i. Transportation Clerk ½	3,175	834,841
5. *Additional Personnel required for 1966*		
a. Administrative Clerk—Engineering & Business	3,720	
b. Administrative Clerk—Data Processing—2	5,000	
c. Supervisor—Director of Pupil Services 9/1/66	4,000	
d. Supervisor—Coordinator of Inst. Materials 9/1/66	3,600	
e. Supervisor Clerk—Part Time	620	
f. Assistant Principal—Bradford 1/1/66.	9,000	
g. Assistant Principal—Washington, Jr. 9/1/66	4,000	
h. Teacher Assistant—1 High School Intern	2,400	
i. Secondary Teachers 6 High Classroom 7 Junior High Classroom — 13 at $2,600	33,800	

APPENDIX II (Cont'd)

j.	Elementary Teachers		
	16 Elementary Classroom		
	7 Special Education		
	1 Elementary Art		
	1 Elementary Physical Education		
	1 Elementary Music		
	1 Psychologist		
	1 Psychiatric Social Worker		
	1 Psychometrist		
	29 at $2,600	75,400	
k.	Secondary Intermural Program	9,850	
l.	Noon Lunch	567	
m.	Substitute Teachers	20,000	
n.	Summer School	96,000	
o.	Central Librarian—Elementary	2,600	
p.	Additional Work Week for Librarians (High: 8 weeks—Jr. High: 8 weeks)	1,600	
q.	Central Library Clerk—1	1,200	
r.	Central Library Clerk—Part Time	1,488	
s.	Attendance		
	2 Home Visitors		
	2 Elementary Guidance Teachers		
	1 Home Bound Teacher		
	1 Teacher for Emotional Handicapped		
	6 at $2,600	15,600	
t.	Custodial		
	4 Custodians for County		
	1 Custodian—Washington Jr.		
	1 Truck Driver		
	1 Mechanic—Tremper		
	7	23,080	
u.	Maintenance		
	1 Engineering Draftsman		
	1 General Maintenance		
	1 Carpenter		
	1 Painter		
	1 Electronic Helper		
	5	34,084	
	4 Carpenters—Summer Help	6,984	354,593
6.	*Other Salary Requirements*		
a.	Custodial Holiday Pay	3,524	
b.	Custodial Additional Overtime	2,258	
c.	Custodial Substitute Help	1,800	
d.	Custodial Outside Activities	1,800	
e.	Maintenance Holiday Pay	469	

f. Maintenance Additional Overtime....	1,000	
g. Chemistry Cadets Abolished.....	(1,267)	9,084
7. *Balance of Increases Granted Mid 1964*		
a. Certificated Administrators.....	300	
b. Supervisors.....	637	
c. Principals.....	2,250	
d. Teachers.....	102,549	
e. Librarians.....	2,307	
f. Home Visitors.....	134	
g. Nurses.....	165	
h. Carpenters.....	540	
i. Painters.....	2,227	111,109
8. *Provision for 1966 Salary Increases—All Groups* (Unable to complete negotiations—Estimated).....		350,000
TOTAL INCREASE IN SALARY ACCOUNTS		1,818,009
SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES (543,915)		
1. Administration Offices.....		5,333
2. Instructional Offices		
a. City.....	7,186	
b. County.....	1,131	8,317
3. General Instructional Supplies		
a. City.....	17,841	
b. County.....	6,632	24,473
4. Art Supplies		
a. City.....	5,278	
b. County.....	3,869	9,147
5. Industrial Arts.....		2,602
6. Home Economics.....		961
7. Music Supplies		
a. City.....	(3,857)	
b. County.....	507	(3,350)
8. Physical Education		
a. City.....	890	
b. County.....	1,707	2,597
9. Safety Education.....		170
10. Library Supplies		
a. City.....	2,104	
b. County.....	379	2,483

APPENDIX II (Cont'd)

SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE (CONT'D)

11. Testing		12,112
12. Vocational School Program		9,206
13. Inservice Training		500
14. Summer School		4,000
15. Texts		
a. City	(1,490)	
b. County	10,584	9,094
16. Library Books		
a. City	20,205	
b. County	6,992	27,197
17. Audio-Visual Materials		
a. City	21,213	
b. County	1,219	22,432
18. Convention & Conference—Instructional		1,000
19. Other Expense		
a. City	2,835	
b. County	379	3,214
20. Attendance		2,000
21. Health Services		
a. City	29	
b. County	198	227
22. Custodial Supplies		
a. City	1,800	
b. County	6,650	8,450
23. Utilities		
a. City	48	
b. County	39,540	39,588
24. Maintenance Supplies (Includes Bldg. Repairs)		
a. City	50,556	
b. County	13,000	63,556
25. Equipment Replacement		
a. City	5,002	
b. County	342	5,344
26. Food Services—Board's Share		(12,268)
27. Milk Program (Transferred to Cafeteria)		43,000
28. Tuition to Other Districts (County)		16,000
29. Transportation		
a. City	12,100	
b. County	162,280	174,380
30. Insurance—Building, Liability, Etc.		
a. City	6,900	
b. County	3,000 (Est.)	9,900

APPENDIX II (Cont'd)

31. Insurance—Hospital & Surgical			
a. City	29,378		
b. County	20,472 (Est.)	49,850	
32. Insurance—Group Life (County Estimated)		1,000	
33. City Retirement—Board's Share			
a. City	35,330		
b. County	13,670 (Est.)	49,000	
34. Social Security—Board's Share			
a. City	17,030		
b. County	7,470 (Est.)	24,500	
35. Rent of Sites & Building Space		6,100	
36. Rent of Equipment		2,300	
37. Employee Flu Shots		5,000	
38. Employees Health Exams			
a. City	100		
b. County	400 (Est.)	500	
TOTAL INCREASE IN SUPPLIES & EXPENSE			343,915
DEBT SERVICE (552,469)			
1. Principal on Debt			
a. City	305,000		
b. County	114,500	419,500	
2. Interest on Debt			
a. City	81,198		
b. County	51,771	132,969	
TOTAL INCREASE IN DEBT SERVICE		552,469	
CAPITAL OUTLAY (167,686)			
1. Site Improvement		9,187	
2. Building Improvement			
a. City	25,115		
b. County	2,950	28,065	
3. Equipment			
a. City	129,471		
b. County	963	130,434	
TOTAL INCREASE IN CAPITAL OUTLAY		167,686	
GRAND TOTAL OF BUDGET INCREASE		3,082,079	

National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities

Cornelius E. Gisriel, *Chairman*
Principal, Woodlawn Jr. H.S.
Baltimore, Maryland

Edna W. Griffin
Vice-Chairman
Coordinator of Intergroup Educ.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Mabel M. Mitchell
Second Vice-Chairman
Classroom Teacher
Boulder City, Nevada

Irvamae Applegate
President, NEA
St. Cloud, Minnesota

Lucille Ball
Classroom Teacher
Little Rock, Arkansas

Howard S. Bretsch
Professor of Education Admin.
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

William G. Carr
Executive Secretary, NEA
Washington, D.C.

Nicholas E. Duff
Classroom Teacher
Excelsior, Minnesota

Helen E. Hay
Classroom Teacher
Denver, Colorado

Edna Lindle
Classroom Teacher
Henderson, Kentucky

Mark R. Shibles
Dean, College of Education
University of Maine
Orono, Maine

Gertrude Sinclair
Classroom Teacher
Barre, Vermont

Robert B. Turner, Jr.
Southwest District Superintendent
Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Florida

Henry M. Williams
Principal, A. M. Story H.S.
Palestine, Texas

Richard Barnes Kennan
Executive Secretary

Oscar E. Thompson
Associate Executive Secretary

Owen Love
Legal Counsel

Richard L. Morgan
Associate Legal Counsel

Donald L. Conrad
Associate Secretary for Ethics

Edwin W. Davis
Associate Secretary

Samuel B. Ethridge
Associate Secretary

William Guardia
Assistant Secretary for Field Studies

Rosena Willis
Information Specialist

Dorothy C. Massie
Technical Writer

Patricia K. Veguilla
Technical Writer

Bernice C. Brigham
Administrative Assistant

Cecil J. Hannan, Assistant Executive Secretary for
Professional Development and Welfare

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
NEA Stock No.: 165-05020 25M